

# The Middlebury Galaxy.

IN THE DARK AND TROUBLED NIGHT THAT IS UPON US, THERE IS NO STAR ABOVE THE HORIZON TO GIVE US A GLEAM OF LIGHT, EXCEPTING THE INTELLIGENT, PATRIOTIC WHIG PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES.—WEBSTER.

VOLUME XII.

MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT, TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 7, 1848.

NUMBER 45.

H. BELL,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.  
TERMS OF VOLUME XII.

Village subscribers, . . . \$2.00  
Mail subscribers, within the State, . . . \$1.50  
No paper, except on the first day of March, sent gratis.  
Mail subscribers out of the State, . . . \$2.00  
Individuals and Companies who take at the office, \$1.50, or \$1.75 if not paid within the year.  
Those who take of Postriders, . . . \$2.00  
If not paid at the end of the year, . . . \$2.25  
No paper, except on the first day of March, sent gratis, except at the option of the proprietor. No contract, without, or payment made to Carriers, cash, keeping, or otherwise, allowed, except as to the editor Post Paid.

JUSTUS COBB, PRINTER,  
BY WHOM ALL KINDS OF BOOK AND JOB PRINT-  
ING WILL BE EXECUTED ON  
SHORT NOTICE.

WE ARE GROWING OLD.  
BY FRANCES BROWN.

We are growing old—how the thought will rise  
When a glance is backward cast  
On some long remembered spot, that lies  
In the silence of the past:  
It may be the shrine of our early vows,  
Or the tomb of early tears;  
But it seems like a far off tale to us,  
In the stormy sea of years.

Oh! wide and wild are the waves that part  
Our steps from their greenness now—  
And we miss the joy of many a heart,  
And the light of many a brow:  
For deep o'er many a stately lark  
Have the whining billows roared  
That steeled with us from that early mark—  
Oh! friends, we are growing old!

Old in the dimness and the dust  
Of our daily toils and cares,  
Old in the wrecks of love and trust,  
Which our burdened memory bears,  
Each form may wear to the passing gaze  
The bloom of life's freshness yet,  
And beams may brighten our latter days  
Which the morning never met.

But oh, the changes we have seen  
In the far and winding way—  
The graves in our path that have grown green,  
And the locks that have grown gray!  
The winters still on our own may spare  
The sale of the gold;  
But we saw their snows upon brighter hair—  
And, friends, we are growing old!

We have gained the world's cold wisdom now,  
We have learned to pause and fear—  
But where are the living fountains, whose flow  
Was a joy of heart to hear?  
We have won the wealth of many a clime,  
And the love of many a page—  
But where is the hope that was in Time  
That its boundless heritage?

Will it come again when the violet wakes,  
And the woods their youth renew?  
We have stood in the light of sunny brakes,  
Where the bloom was deep and blue;  
And our souls might joy in the spring-time then  
But the joy was faint and cold—  
For it ne'er could give us the youth again  
(Of the hearts that are growing old.)  
(London Athenaeum.)

Mr. Speaker, the well known editor of the New York "Satanstoe," is also a member of the House of Assembly. A few days since, he made the following speech, in asking leave of absence for a colleague, in consequence of the occurrence of an interesting event in said colleague's family. It does not elevate one's ideas of legislative dignity; but dignity and decorum are things that Mike never studied very deeply. With grave solemnity, he arose and said:

Mr. Speaker—I have to announce to the House that last evening, while at his boarding house, my colleague, Mr. Titus, had the fortune to receive a most important communication by telegraph. While reading the note his countenance betrayed strong emotions of joy. No May morning, resplendent with the sun's horizontal beams, ever shone more brightly than the face of my friend. The bystanders anxiously desired to know what had caused such excitement in his mind. Utterance was denied him. He thrust the note into his pocket and went into a back room. One of his colleagues, Mr. Rodman, is a scientific man, and gave it as his opinion that poor Mr. Titus had been too freely taking that exhilarating and wonderful liquor, chloroform. But as soon as the state of his feelings was ascertained, the mystery was explained. We read and were satisfied. The telegraph brought intelligence that Mr. Titus had presented her husband with an heir; and not an heir only, but a boy; and not a boy only, but a fine boy! The explanation of Napoleon when Mr. Titus's son was born, was that when compared with that of Mr. Titus. As soon as he could command his faculties he called for his champagne and cigars. Official dignity was thrown aside. Our friend was no longer Mr. Titus the legislator, but Mr. Titus the father of a boy. Taking kindly leave of his friends, and tendering his heartfelt thanks to all who could be supposed to have contributed in any way to so auspicious an event, he departed in last night's cars to see his happy spouse and infant heir. I ask leave of absence for him for ten days.

It is needless to say that leave was granted amid roars of laughter.

CONVERSION OF REV. JEDEDIAH BUSHNELL.

At the age of 23, Mr. Bushnell was devoted to the world in the business of a tanner, when a stranger called at his back-shop to inquire the way. After receiving the desired information and turning to pursue his journey, the stranger still lingered, and inquired of Mr. Bushnell whether he was in "the way" of life, dropped a few words with deep seriousness, and with a countenance and tone indicating an affectionate concern for his salvation, added these lines of Watts:  
"Sinners, awake betimes; ye fools, be wise;  
Awake, before the dreadful morning rise;  
Change your vain thoughts, your crooked ways amend.  
Fly to the Saviour, make the Judge your friend!"  
Mr. Bushnell was brought to cherish entirely new views of himself as a sinner, and to repose his confidence for salvation wholly in the merits of the Redeemer; and soon had a great desire to become a messenger of salvation to others. He entered on a course of collegiate and theological study, became a useful missionary in the new settlements, then, for a long term of years, a successful pastor, and "flushed his course" with joy.

SPEECH OF  
MR. A. STEWART,  
OF PENNSYLVANIA,IN REVIEW OF THE  
FREE-TRADE DOCTRINES CONTAIN-  
ED IN MR. WALKER'S AN-  
NUAL REPORT ON  
THE FINANCES.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 11, 1848.

MR. STEWART, in rising, said he wished to avail himself of the first opportunity presented of reviewing some of the leading topics of the late Report of the Secretary of the Treasury in vindication of free trade and the tariff of 1846.

He felt, however, strongly tempted, before doing so, to say a word or two in reply to some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. McClelland.) That eloquent gentleman has just pronounced a studied and high wrought eulogium on the President. A eulogy, not upon one of the department, but upon the living, ruling, and patronizing dispensing President of the day. The gentleman calls Mr. Polk "the Model President."

Washington, Jefferson, and Madison dwelled into utter insignificance before the finished perfection of James K. Polk! And the gentleman tells us, that it has been reserved for this, our model President, to build up and finish the great "Democratic Column," which was to stand as a bright and enduring monument to his illustrious Administration. Now, sir, what is this column, and of what is it composed? In the first place, we are told that, to prepare a foundation for this new column of the progressive democracy, our President found it necessary to get rid of the rubbish, by tearing down and removing the old Democratic column, erected by the joint labors of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. The elements of which were, Protection to National Industry—Internal Improvements, harbors, rivers, and roads—Good Faith and Justice, toward all nations, and Peace and Harmony with all—a adherence to the Constitution—economy in the Public Expenditures—above all, opposition to Standing Armies—to Wars—to National Debts—and to heavy and oppressive Taxation—these were the elements which composed this old fashioned Democratic column, which Mr. Polk and his party have utterly demolished and scattered to the four winds—peace and protection, rivers and harbors, economy, constitution, and all. In its stead, they have erected this new and wonderful column of the progressive democracy, decked off in regal splendor, with a crown upon its head—built with paper money, and based upon an empty treasury.

The next element in this splendid democratic structure, is military glory—war—war made by the President himself, in violation of the Constitution, by sending his army to Mexico, instead of sending his message to Congress, the war-making power, then in session.

Next in order comes a standing army, and an overshadowing navy; then follows, of course, an enormous national debt, pension lists, and heavy and oppressive taxation, which, by foreign goods, but upon our own people, by direct taxation. And should the people complain, then, like his illustrious friend Santa Anna, with his standing army of one hundred thousand men, this "Model President" of ours can administer an anodyne of *bullets and bayonets* to cure the discontents, and teach the people submission to their masters.

It is this ancient and ruined column we wish to re-establish—the old Washingtonian and Jeffersonian column of other and better days; this is the *Whig* column, which the dread "military chieftain" referred to by the gentleman, intends to reconstruct; he intends he will adopt the policy of the *first President*, not the last. His column will be very unlike that of the gentleman's, all bright and dazzling with military glory, built of the bones and cemented with the blood of thousands of the best men of the Republic. Sir, the gentleman seems to be in ecstasies with his model master, and his gorgeous column; in celebrating its advent, they seem to have qualified their goblets of glory to their bitter dregs. But in the very midst of their revelry, sporting their pleasure boats in the ocean of blood and rivers of tears which war and pestilence have made, and listening to the delightful music made by the groans of the dying, and the shrieks and cries of despairing widows and orphans, all at once the gentleman is startled by the shadow of a "military chieftain"—a phantom which arose suddenly, "to scare their eye balls," in the midst of their joyous revelry; and looking across to this side of the House, the gentleman from Illinois exclaims, "don't get behind that 'military chieftain'!" And why shall we not rally under this noble old chief? Is it because he never leads his followers but to victory? But if the shadow of a nodding plume, and the distant rumbling of the cannon, have so alarmed the gentleman and his friends, how will they feel when they behold "Old Rough" in their midst—when they hear the rattling of Capt. Bragg's grape and cannon—when they hear the cracking of the rifles, and the roar of the big guns? Sir, the gentleman and his party, his "model President," and all; will fly, as did the Mexicans at Buena Vista. But the gentleman contends not only that Mr. Polk is the "model President," but that he is the "reflex" of the popular opinion of this nation! *Polk* the "reflex" of public sentiment! Sir, as to that matter, let the gentleman look at this side of the House, and then at that; at the last session, there was a majority of about two to one for the President; now we have a majority against him. This was one "reflex"; but there was another at hand, the "reflex" of "Rough and Ready," the blaze and brightness of which, would utterly confound and consume his enemies. But enough of this. I leave his "model President" to the gentleman and his reflections.

I will now proceed to the task before me—the examination of Mr. Walker's late Report, which has been lauded to the skies as "the greatest production of the age"—a document which has been printed in German, and I know not how many other languages, and by thousands and tens of thousands scattered broadcast over the land—a work of great labor and ability, and admirably calculated, if not intended, to mislead the people in regard to the practical operations of free trade and the tariff of 1846. And I will now say, in my place, which I hold myself bound to make good, that there never issued from an official source a document containing so many and such gross and palpable misstatements, as are contained in this celebrated Report. Misstatements, of hundreds and thousands, and of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. I will show, by his own reports, mistakes and errors, amounting to fifteen millions in regard to the revenue in a single year—eighty millions in ten years—one hundred and seventy-six millions in regard to another matter—and twenty

others of smaller or larger amount. I will give gentlemen on the other side, day and date, book and page, for what I say. I beg them to submit these statements to the Secretary, and with his aid and assistance, disprove them if they can. I am not surprised that the Secretary was so bold under the Herculean task. It is an easy matter to make the truth appear to be true, but to make an error appear to be truth, was a task too heavy for the acknowledged ability of the Secretary, who, we are told, sunk under the effort.

The Secretary, in his Report, has labored hard, and with great ingenuity, to establish three positions. First—that low duties always produce an increased amount of revenue. Second—that a reduction of duties have not only increased imports, but also exports, and especially the export of breadstuffs and provisions. Third—that low duties favor American labor—agricultural, manufacturing, and mechanical—and promote the national wealth and prosperity at large. Now, I assert that precisely the reverse of these several propositions is proved by the whole experience of the country, from its foundation to the present time, and I will prove it by the reports and documents furnished for the most part by Mr. W. himself.

THE EFFECT OF THE TARIFF OF 1846, AND OF HIGH AND LOW DUTIES GENERALLY, UPON REVENUE.

The first position of the Report is, that low duties always increase revenue, and that such has been the effect of the tariff of 1846. The tariff of 1846 has reduced the rate of duties, on an average, about one third—from 22 to 32 per cent. Under the tariff of 1842, one hundred millions of dutiable imports yielded about thirty-two millions of gross revenue, of course it will now require one hundred and fifty millions, one third more, under the tariff of 1846, to yield the same amount of revenue; to get the same revenue, you must now export fifty additional millions of dollars, and destroy fifty millions of present American supply, to make room for these additional fifty millions of foreign goods—thus supporting and enriching foreign labor, and destroying our own.

The President and Secretary both repeat, that the tariff of 1846 has not only greatly increased the national prosperity, but that it has actually increased the revenue eight millions of dollars. Now, so far from this being true, it clearly appears from the Secretary's own showing, that the revenue would have been \$7,202,637 more, had the tariff of 1842 continued in operation. So that instead of gaining eight millions, we have lost more than seven millions of revenue by the tariff of 1846—a blunder of more than fifteen millions in a single year.

Now, for the facts I refer gentlemen to the first pages of Mr. Walker's three last annual Reports on the finances; they will there see it stated that, in the fiscal year 1845, the revenue from customs was \$27,928,112; that in 1846, the revenue was \$26,712,667—producing an average amount of revenue under the tariff of 1841, of \$27,120,389. Whereas, in 1847, under Mr. Walker's great revenue tariff of 1846; he himself states that the revenue from customs is but \$23,747,864—nearly three millions less than in 1846, and nearly four millions less than in 1845. Yet we are told, in the face of these official facts, that the tariff of 1846 has increased the revenue eight millions of dollars. But this is not all; by referring to the Secretary's late report on Commerce and Navigation, (not yet printed), it will be seen that the dutiable imports in 1847 were \$10,365,404 more than in 1845, under the tariff of 1842; and had it been still in force, this excess, at 32 per cent, (the average of the duties under the tariff of 1842), would have yielded \$3,416,429 of revenue, which, added to the excess of revenue received in 1845 over 1847, \$3,778,228, makes the sum of \$7,194,657 more revenue under the tariff of 1842, had it remained in operation, than has been received under the tariff of 1846. Now what becomes of the Secretary's eight millions of increased revenue? Instead of eight millions *plus*, we are told that the revenue is *minus*. Or to prove it in another and simpler form; Mr. W. says the average of duties under the act of 1846, is 22 per cent, and under the act of 1842, they are 32 per cent—consequently, the revenue upon the same imports must be one-third less. So that instead of \$23,747,864, the amount received under the tariff of 1846, we should have received, under the tariff of 1842, one third more, viz: \$31,665,812. These are mathematical results, derived from Mr. Walker's own Reports, and there is no escape for him or his defenders. I call on them to deny it if they can. But besides all this, Mr. Walker, in his annual Report last winter, p. 1, estimates the receipts from customs for the fiscal year 1847, at \$27,928,112; he has received, he says, but \$23,747,864—four millions less than his estimates. Yet the President and Secretary both boast that the tariff of 1846 has more than realized their expectations. Now *four* millions less than their estimate equals their expectations, then they must have, for the purpose of deception, deliberately made their estimate four millions more than they expected to receive. Can the Secretary explain this? I hope he'll try, but I predict he will not.

But Mr. Walker contends that the tariff of 1846, having greatly increased the export of domestic products, has, as a matter of course, brought in a corresponding increase of imports and revenue. But has the tariff of 1846 increased the amount of domestic exports? I say it has not, and I will prove it by Mr. Walker's own figures. I will show conclusively that the only increase of exports has been made in breadstuffs and provisions, required to prevent starvation, and would have been taken to the same extent, and paid for in the same way, without regard to our tariff, or any thing of the kind. Now take the export of domestic products for ten years past, from 1835 to 1845, and deduct therefrom the amount of breadstuffs and provisions, and it will be found that the annual export of domestic products, exclusive of breadstuffs and provisions, was \$91,813,589; then take the export of domestic products during the last fiscal year, under the tariff of 1846, viz: \$150,637,464, and deduct the breadstuffs and provisions, \$65,906,273, and it leaves of every thing else but \$84,730,191—more than seven millions less of domestic exports last year, exclusive of provisions and breadstuffs, than the average of the preceding ten years; yet, in the face of these facts, furnished by his official Report on Commerce and Navigation, he gravely tells the American people that free trade and the tariff of 1846, and not the famine in Europe, has produced the great increase of exports and imports. The Report not being printed, I cannot refer to the pages from which I derive these facts, but they are accessible to gentlemen who wish to inquire.

Next as to the modus operandi, which the gentleman, the sleight-of-hand, by which falsehoods are made to appear true, the plan by which the President and Secretary attempt to make it out that they have received more revenue under the tariff of 1846 than was received under that of 1842. How is this done? It is

done by cutting up the years; taking a few months of one year and a few months of another—five months under the tariff of 1842 and seven under the tariff of 1846. Now every body knows that the tariff of 1846 was passed in July, and did not go into operation until December, during this period of four or five months imports paying duties were almost entirely arrested. The fact being that the duties would in a few days be greatly reduced, a very large amount of goods which would have come in and paid duty according to the then existing tariff of 1842, were withheld till the duties came down. They were piled up in warehouses or kept in bond till the tariff of 1846 and low duties took effect; besides, goods which had paid heavy duties were re-exported, and the duties withdrawn from the Treasury, to be returned when the duties came down—thus a pipe of brandy, for instance, which under the tariff of 1842 had paid one dollar per gallon duty, the owner, by re-exporting it with a drawback of the duty, and reimporting it immediately after the tariff of 1846 took effect, reducing the duty nearly one-half, would clear forty cents a gallon; thus robbing the tariff of 1842, and giving its revenue to the tariff of 1846. During this period of five months, of course little revenue, in comparison was coming in, though the country was still nominally under the tariff of 1842. Now these are the months which this very candid Secretary takes for his estimate of the produce of the tariff of 1846. As soon as the reduced tariff of 1846 went into operation, these goods which had been held back waiting for the reduced duties, were at once poured in, and in pours revenue by millions. The goods and duties withdrawn from the tariff of 1842 and returned under the tariff of 1846; and these are the months which this truth-seeking Secretary takes as showing the comparative product of this model tariff contrasted with five months of the tariff of 1842, giving a little over seven millions for five months, when, for two years before, the revenue had exceeded an average of twenty-seven millions! And this is put forth as a fair comparison. This is no deception. Oh, no; this is fair. This is the way to bring truth to the people! He might as well compare the strength of a giant and that of a child, by putting down what the giant could lift when on a sick bed and in his last hours, and what the child could lift in the vigor of health and under a sudden and violent excitement. Would this be a very satisfactory way of proving that the child was stronger than the giant? Yet the comparison would be just as fair.

The next thing the learned Secretary attempts to prove is, that under low duties more revenue is always obtained than under high duties. To show this, he selects ten years income under high tariffs, and ten years under a low one. He selects ten years, from 1832 to 1842, under the compromise bill, for his low tariff, and then ten years, under the high tariff of 1824 and 1828, and two years under the tariff of 1842, as the high tariff period. Now I assert that these very years, his own figures prove that we got eighty-two millions more under the high tariff than we did under the low. For the proof, I refer gentlemen and the Secretary to his own official report on the Finances in 1845, p. 956. Here you have his own report. Take it down, gentlemen; I desire you to make a minute of what I state, for what I say I can prove. I hope the ex-chancellor of the exchequer (Mr. McKay) will pay special attention to these statements. I say, on Mr. Walker's own showing, that under the ten years of low tariff the receipts were \$214,885,858, and that under the high tariff years the receipts were \$297,842,211. The difference in favor of the high tariff is \$82,956,353—\$8,295,635 per year; and yet the Secretary and President say that all experience proves that low tariffs give the most revenue! Whether such gross misstatements proceed from ignorance or design he I would not say, but it was one or the other. I refer, (said Mr. S.) to date, book, and page. Let them look it up. I want to see the statement. I suppose when he sent us the Report, with all these confident statements, supported by figures, too, he thought it would answer its purpose. He owes it to his character for truth and candor to come out and admit or deny this statement, or authorize some friend to do it for him on this floor. Will it be done? We will see. Here are the tables taken carefully from Mr. Walker's Report:

Revenue for ten years, under low tariff, from 1832 to 1842.	
1833	\$21,177,578
1834	18,969,705
1835	25,890,726
1836	30,818,327
1837	18,134,131
1838	19,702,825
1839	25,554,553
1840	15,104,790
1841	19,919,492
1842	16,622,746
\$214,885,858	

Revenue for ten years, under the high tariffs of 1824, 1828, and 1842.	
1825	\$37,653,871
1826	26,088,861
1827	27,948,956
1828	29,251,251
1829	27,688,701
1830	28,389,505
1831	36,596,118
1832	29,341,175
1842	29,236,357
1845	30,952,416
\$297,842,211	
\$82,956,353	

Difference in favor of high tariff in 10 years, (\$82,956,353) Loss of revenue, in ten years, under the low tariff, \$8,295,635 per annum!

THE COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF HIGH AND LOW TARIFFS ON EXPORTS AND IMPORTS—BALANCE OF TRADE, &c.

The Secretary here affirms that the balance of trade is always in our favor under a low tariff; that our exports exceed our imports, and that the exports of breadstuffs and provisions are especially increased. Now I say that, deducting the imports during the ten years of high tariffs, selected by the Secretary for comparison, from the imports during the ten years of low tariffs, and it will appear that the balance against the country under the low tariff was \$401,976,076—equal to \$40,197,607 a year; and, deducting during each period the goods re-exported, the balance against the country would be increased to the sum of \$423,455,724. And how had it been paid? By two hundred millions of state bonds sent to Europe to pay for goods, a mercantile debt of the low duty period, in 1840, '41, and '42, in repudiation and bankruptcy, State, national and individual, throughout the land. Yet we

are told by the President and Secretary that low duties produce prosperity, national and individual, and especially the prosperity of the farmers and laborers—of the "toiling millions," "the voters"—those who control the policy and measures of Government. Yes, sir, these are the very men they would thus deceive and ruin. Here are the tables of exports and imports taken from Mr. Walker's annual Report on the Finances, dated 3d December, 1845, page 956:

Imports in ten years under low tariff or compromise bill.	
1833	\$108,118,311
1834	126,521,332
1835	149,895,742
1836	183,980,035
1837	140,989,217
1838	113,717,404
1839	162,092,132
1840	107,411,519
1841	127,946,177
1842	100,162,087
\$1,326,563,956	
\$401,976,067	

Imports in ten years under the high tariffs of 1824, 1828, and 1842.	
1825	\$96,340,075
1826	84,974,477
1827	79,484,068
1828	88,509,824
1829	74,492,527
1830	78,876,920
1831	105,191,124
1832	101,029,266
1842	108,435,037
1845	117,254,564
\$924,587,860	

Excess of imports in ten years of low tariff \$401,976,067. Equal to forty millions a year against the country.

Yet we are told that low tariffs always favor the country and promote the national prosperity.

But this is not all. Take the exports from the imports during these ten years of low duties, and it will be found that the debt against the people of the United States in favor of foreigners is \$176,166,242. What a sum of national property is here exhibited! But Mr. S. said there was another very important fact he wished here to bring to the attention of the House and the country—it was this: that, during eight years of the highest tariffs, of '24 and '28, one hundred and three millions of surplus revenue was applied to the payment of the public debt; and that during a corresponding period of eight years of low duties under the compromise bill, after wasting forty millions of surplus revenue, a debt of about fifty millions was contracted; showing a failure of revenue to meet expenditures, under the low duties, of about eighty millions in eight years; and it further appears, that after the tariff was raised in 1842, there was paid in the four years of its existence, nearly forty millions of public debt; and now, since the repeal of the tariff of 1842, and the restoration of low duties, the revenue has again run down, and the national debt is again running up at the rate of forty or fifty millions a year. Here are facts that speak volumes as to the effect of high and low tariffs on the revenue and national property. What a commentary is this on Polk and Walker's theory of low duties producing high revenue, and high tariffs producing low revenue!

Such is the evidence in favor of Mr. Walker's position, that low tariffs always turn the balance of trade in our favor. Such are the happy effects of his policy of free trade. Low tariffs always have been, and always will be, the ruin of the country. Let any man look at the scenes of general distress, which have always followed this insane policy; the ruin of flourishing establishments, the multiplication of bankruptcies, the advertisements of sheriffs' sales, the destruction of credit and confidence, the prostration of enterprise, the stagnation of trade, and general condition of discontent and misery which have invariably succeeded the adoption of these false and visionary theories, and he will find one of the best criterions to judge of their political soundness. And such, I say, will always be the consequence of a repeal of the experiment. Mr. Walker says that they never have followed. I say they always have. Their whole theory is a mistake, and practice will ever so prove it to be, and when it is put forth in the very face of facts which every intelligent man knows, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is done to deceive; that there is an object to be attained by misleading the public mind.

Again: The Secretary asserts that low duties have always been accompanied by a greatly increased export of breadstuffs. And he refers during the last season, not to the famine in Ireland, and over the South of Europe—not at all; but solely to his model tariff of 1846! That is what has done it all. Low duties, not starvation, have induced the people of the old world suddenly to eat Indian meal, and call out for American flour and American beef. But I put the same question to Southern gentlemen in this House—if this reduction of duties is the thing which has produced so large an amount of breadstuffs, pray why had it not, in the same degree, increased the exports of cotton and tobacco? The export of cotton under this model tariff of our model President, has been less by four millions of dollars than the average exports of ten years past, (from 1835 to 1845), less of tobacco by a million and a half—less of manufactures by nearly two millions—less of the productions of the forest—less of almost everything but breadstuffs and provisions. How is this accounted for? Is it because the tariff of 1846 has a double Walker's specific speech of '46 has a double operation—purative and astrigent as to everything else. Who can doubt that famine, and nothing but famine, has produced this greatly increased exportation of breadstuffs.

But what produced this falling off under this laudible free trade policy? Was that, too, the fruit of the tariff of 1846? Why has there been no increased exports of cotton? Southern gentlemen, cotton growers, how is this? And you, ye tobacco-growers, how comes it that, under Mr. Walker's patent machine to increase exports, the export of tobacco has fallen off a million and a half? What say you to that? Was this the happy effect of the tariff of 1846? The Secretary tells us that starvation in Europe has had little or nothing to do with the consumption there of our breadstuffs; that nothing whatever. Well the starvation has ceased, breadstuffs are down, and now the redoubtable Mr. Secretary Walker is like to be caught in his own trap! I tell you that in a few weeks more the corn laws in England, sliding scale and all, will be in full operation.

They were merely suspended, not repealed, during the famine; and now, when the famine is over, and Mr. Walker is caught in Sir Robert Peel's trap, the corn laws go into full effect on the first day of March next, and then exports cease, the revenue falls off, and Mr. Walker will have to appeal to us to restore the tariff of 1842, to replenish his empty treasury, and feed his starving armies and officers, civil and military, at home and abroad.

Referring again to the low tariff period, from 1833 to 1842, under the compromise bill, and the high tariff period, from 1817 to 1832, the Secretary says "the average exports of breadstuffs and provisions were much larger in the years of low compared with high duties."

Indeed, he repeats this over and over again, that the "export of breadstuffs and provisions was much greater under low than high duties," which he says "the *Tables of the Treasurer clearly prove*." Now, I propose to examine some of these tables, and will "clearly prove by them" just the reverse of the Secretary's position, to an extent that will astonish the Secretary himself, if he can be astonished at any thing. I will show that, during four years of the period referred to, under the tariff of 1828, the highest tariff we ever had, we actually exported to Great Britain more than one hundred tons as much breadstuffs and provisions as we did during four years under the low duties of the compromise bill.

Mr. Holmes says, you mean, I presume, one hundred per cent not one hundred times more. I mean, (said Mr. S.) what I say, one hundred times more.

Mr. Holmes—Please give me the facts. Mr. S.—I will, and I want you to take them down—examine them at your leisure, and disprove them if you can. Here are the facts taken from the annual Treasury Reports on "Commerce and Navigation," carefully revised by an officer of this House. I refer to Great Britain, not only because she is our principal customer, but because Mr. Walker has referred particularly to our exports of breadstuffs to England, and says, we must take more of her goods, or "she will have to pay specie for our breadstuffs, and not having it to spare, she will reduce the price of cotton." But here is the table which he would give to the gentleman from S. Carolina, (Mr. Holmes,) for his special attention.

Four years under Imports from Great Britain, under low tariff (1833-36), and four years under high tariff (1828-31).	
1833	\$2,947,417
1834	2,947,417
1835	2,947,417
1836	2,947,417
\$11,839,678	
Average per year \$2,959,919	

Four years under Imports from Great Britain, under high tariff (1828-31), and four years under low tariff (1833-36).	
1828	\$6,000,000
1829	6,000,000
1830	6,000,000
1831	6,000,000
\$24,000,000	
Average per year \$6,000,000	

Thus it appears, from official documents, that during four years of our highest tariff—the tariff of 1828—we took about half as many goods from Great Britain, and she took one hundred times as much of our breadstuffs as she took during four years of our lowest tariff. Yet Mr. Walker repeats, over and over again, that our export of breadstuffs has always been greater, and refers to Treasury tables to prove it! Has Mr. Walker looked at these reports? Does he know what they contain? He surely does not, or he never would have ventured upon such statements as these. Here it is seen that, in 1836, we took \$6,000,000 of dollars worth of goods from Great Britain, and she took 1,684 dollars worth of breadstuffs from us in payment. Yet Mr. Walker says in his Report of 1845, page 13, that we must take more English goods, otherwise "the increased sum England will have to pay for our breadstuffs will make it impossible for her to buy our goods, and not having it to spare, she brings down even to a greater extent, our cotton." Eighty-six millions of British goods will not pay for 1,684 dollars worth of American breadstuffs, and the balance England